IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO.319 OF 2006

Shri Dynanoba B.Suryavanshi ...Applicant
Vs.
The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ...Respondents

Shri K.V.Narayanan for the Applicant.
Shri U.V.Nikam, A.P.P. for the State.

CORAM : A. S. OKA, J.
DATE : AUGUST 25, 2006.

P.C.:

. Not on board. Taken on board.

1. Heard the Advocate appearing for the Applicant. By this Revision Application, the Applicant has taken exception to judgment and order dated 03rd July, 2006 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge by which the learned Judge has condoned delay in filing Revision Application filed by the second Respondent.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the Applicant submitted that no sufficient cause was made out for condonation of delay. He submitted that delay of each and every day was not explained by the Applicant. He submitted that reply filed by the

Applicant has not been taken into consideration.

3. I have considered the submissions. The learned Additional Sessions Judge has noted that the present age of the second Respondent is about sixty five years and his both sons are settled abroad. The learned Judge has also considered the fact that the concerned Advocate who was attending to the matter of the first Respondent had met with an accident and for considerable time the said Advocate was not attending routine work. It is well settled position of law that a liberal approach is contemplated while deciding an Application for condonation of delay. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the learned Additional Sessions Judge has accepted the explanation given by the second Respondent and has condoned delay. No case is made out for interference in revision. The Revision Application is rejected.

JUDGE